



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,280	09/17/2003	Ciprian Agapi	BOC9-2003-0060 (434)	4539
40987 7590 03/20/2007 AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			EXAMINER LEWIS, ALICIA M	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 03/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/664,280

Applicant(s)

AGAPI ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia M. Lewis

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Request for Continues Examination (RCE) filed December 19, 2006. Claims 1, 6-8, 13, 14 and 16-18 are currently amended; thus claims 1-18 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mock et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0125142 A1) ('Mock').

With respect to claims 1, and 8, Mock teaches:

receiving a system request to visually display with a graphical user interface the grammar files in the presentation list (Figure 7, paragraphs 20 and 21);

sorting the grammar files based on a first criterion that assigns user-defined grammar files greater priority over built-in grammar files (elements 214, 216, 1102, 1104 and 1106 in Figure 11, paragraph 32);

sorting the grammar files according to a second criterion (Figures 11 and 12);
and

simultaneously displaying user-defined grammar files and the built-in grammar files within the presentation list wherein each user-defined grammar file is visually distinguishable from each built-in grammar file (Figures 11 and 12, paragraphs 32 and 33).

The first criterion is sorting based on user (i.e., mother, father, son and daughter). The files are sorted by having different backgrounds. The user-defined files (reference user's/mother's calendar events) are given greater priority by having the associated comments (214 and 216) shown with their messages (220 and 222). The second criterion is sorting by time.

With respect to claims 3 and 10, Mock teaches wherein the step of visually displaying comprises presenting the presentation list such that each grammar file is labeled with a label indicating whether the grammar file is a user-defined grammar file or a built-in grammar file (Figures 11 and 12, paragraphs 32 and 33).

Mock teaches that the files are labeled by having unique backgrounds.

With respect to claims 5 and 12, Mock teaches wherein the user-defined grammar files and the built-in grammar files can share the same name (element 228 in Figures 2-5).

With respect to claims 7 and 14, Mock teaches wherein the second criterion is a chronological order (Figures 11 and 12).

3. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US Patent 6,662,178 B2).

With respect to claim 16, Lee teaches:

receiving a system request to visually display with a graphical user interface the grammar files in the presentation list (column 4 lines 7-11);

sorting the grammar files based on a first criterion that assigns user-defined grammar files greater priority over built-in grammar files (column 4 lines 12-15);

sorting the grammar files according to a second criterion (column 4 lines 49-57);
and

visually displaying the presentation list wherein each user-defined grammar file is visually distinguishable from each built-in grammar file (column 4 lines 12-15, 49-57).

In Lee's invention, a system request to display a grammar file is equivalent to a system receiving a search query. The sorting of the grammar files by user defined grammar files and built-in grammar files is equivalent to displaying the search results of the query. The user defined grammar files are the files that satisfy the search query, and are thus given a greater priority by being displayed. The built-in files are the files in a database that are not displayed because they do not match the query. Because the

Art Unit: 2164

user-defined files are displayed as results, they are visually distinguishable from the built-in files.

With respect to claim 17, Lee teaches wherein the second criterion is an alphabetical order (column 4 lines 53-56).

With respect to claim 18, Lee teaches wherein the second criterion is a chronological order (column 4 lines 53-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0125142 A1) ('Mock') in view of Gusmorino et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0251748 A1) ('Gusmorino').

With respect to claims 2 and 9, Mock teaches displaying the grammar files (Figure 11).

Mock does not teach wherein the method further comprises the step of displaying the grammar files when a user selects the grammar files.

Gusmorino teaches a system and method for viewing and editing multi-value properties (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the method further comprises the step of displaying the grammar files when a user selects the grammar files (Figure 4, paragraph 63).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mock by the teaching of Gusmorino because displaying the grammar files when a user selects the grammar files would enable an improved way of handling the display of properties, and of managing multi-value properties, to simplify the user's experience in navigating and managing files on a computing system (Gusmorino, paragraph 7).

With respect to claims 4 and 11, Mock as modified teaches wherein the step of visually displaying comprises presenting the presentation list such that each grammar file is presented in a text format that indicated whether the grammar file is a user-defined grammar file or a built-in grammar file (Gusmorino, paragraph 123).

With respect to claims 6 and 13, Mock as modified teaches wherein the second criterion is an alphabetical order (Gusmorino, paragraph 141).

With respect to claim 15, Mock as modified teaches wherein the presentation list is at least one among a drop-down list and a list box (Gusmorino, Figure 27, paragraphs 108 and 149).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Regarding claims 16-18, Applicant argues that Lee does not teach the current amendment of "simultaneously displaying files". However, this new limitation has not been added to independent claim 16.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis
March 13, 2007



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER